

REMARKS

Claims 20-28, 30, 31 and 34-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 20-27 and 34-40 stand rejected. Claims 1-19, 29, 32 and 33 were previously cancelled, and Claims 20, 26, 34 and 38 have been amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the allowability of Claims 28-31.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-27 and 34-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,408,391) in view of Monroe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,391). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially the Examiner will note that minor amendments have been made to independent Claim 20 to more positively recite that the onboard security management system is adapted to initiate an action to stop intrusion based on a set of policies, and such that the action is directed to one or more selected user access points. Additional language has been added to the penultimate paragraph of claim 20 to even more clearly recite that the onboard securing management system is further adapted to update said set of policies. Finally, new language has been added to the end of claim 20 that recites a status indicator to indicate a status of the onboard network. These limitations are not shown or suggested by the Huff et al./Monroe combination. The

examiner will also note that claim 20 is now similar in scope to allowed claim 28, considering the new, positive language that the intrusion detection system is able to initiate an action that is directed to one or more selected user access points, and the new limitation of the status indicator that is able to indicate a status of the onboard network. Thus, the Examiner should now appreciate the similarity of various limitations present in both claim 20 and allowed claim 28. Claims 34 and 38 have been amended along lines somewhat similar to claim 20 to more positively recite the security monitoring features of the present system and method.

It also bears repeating that Huff et al actually teaches away from including all of the components needed for security monitoring a network on a mobile platform, on the mobile platform itself. As noted in significant detail in the previously submitted appeal brief and prior responses, this is an important distinction. The present system and method does not suffer from a loss of security that the system in Huff et al. would suffer from if the off-board server (located on the trucks 700 and 732) was to lose its communications link with the trucks being monitored for security purposes. This important distinction has been apparently glossed over by the Examiner, but it cannot be ignored. Huff et al. simply deals with addressing the security issue in a fundamentally different (actually opposite) way. While the Monroe et al. reference does deal with the operation of an electronic surveillance system for monitoring various conditions relating to an aircraft, this surveillance can apparently only be done while the aircraft is at a terminal or taxiing about at an airport. Again, as the Examiner will appreciate, this is fundamentally different than the system now being claimed, which enables the security of an on-board network to be monitored at all times whether the

aircraft is on the ground or in the air. Even interpreting the teachings of the Huff et al./Monroe et al. combination in the light most positive to the Examiner's position, this capability still is not suggested by this combination of references.

Hindsight Reconstruction

The undersigned most respectfully submits that the present office action presents a classic instance of hindsight reconstruction. Nowhere in either of the Huff et al. or Monroe et al. references is there any suggestion of combining the teachings in the manner done by the Examiner. In fact, a clear indicator that the teachings of these two references would **NOT** have been combined by one of ordinary skill in this art is the fact that Huff et al. explicitly teaches locating the servers that do the security monitoring off the trucks that are being monitored. This is unquestionably teaching away from including the security monitoring system all on a single vehicle. The Examiner is most respectfully requested to re-consider this critically important factor that has essentially been ignored by the Examiner up to the present time.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 20, 2007

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs